

impossible, if the same words were used in the royal recommendation accompanying other legislation, for members of this House to move any sort of amendment at all. I submit to the Chair that "the manner prescribed" could be expanded to cover all aspects of the bill.

Most people realize that in the interpretation of a statute, the whole statute must be taken together in order to get the meaning. According to the rather absurd, argument advanced by the parliamentary secretary, that would mean that any attempt to amend a particular clause in a meaningful way would be an infraction, and would prohibit a member of the House or a party in this House from making a change.

I am rather shocked at the parliamentary secretary's attempt to do this. He is dredging back 200 years to a royal recommendation, the prerogative of Charles I, James I, Elizabeth I, and Henry VIII, that highly undomesticated monarch. Mr. Speaker, those were the rules that prevailed in those days—"the king can do no wrong"—so the Commons, struggling to do their job were confronted time after time with the fact that the king had brought in a bill and said to them, "You can proceed with this bill for these purposes, but our recommendation circumscribes you, so you are limited in what you do."

We are in the twentieth century, Mr. Speaker. We are a parliament struggling to deal with the tremendous problems which the group of hon. nonentities opposite have been unable to deal with. The parliamentary secretary is attempting to invoke this harsh and rigid rule which is founded on what was done 250 or 300 years ago. I am ashamed that the parliamentary secretary would try to urge Your Honour to delve into the mists of antiquity to call up that rule.

I know we find the rule in Beauchesne today, but if Your Honour were to do the research he would find its origin rests in the days of the kings. Remember, Mr. Speaker, kings lost their heads, and Speakers even lost their jobs from time to time.

Mr. Sharp: No threats now!

Mr. Baldwin: I cited a case yesterday where the Speaker was so incensed at what the government was trying to do that he got up and made a speech. I would not hold it against Your Honour if in making this decision you saw fit to censure the government. I would be prepared to sit down and listen if you were to find that what the parliamentary secretary is trying to do is wrong.

If Your Honour is not satisfied that the sound arguments of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) and the hon. member for Dauphin have demolished the rather trivial proposition of the hon. parliamentary secretary, I would call upon you to consider the consequences of a ruling of this kind which prohibits the opposition or a member from making an amendment. After all, it is only on a contingency basis that those royal revenues—which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) loves so well—will be in any way circumscribed. There is no certainty of it.

If one looks at the Public Accounts and examines the expenditures made under this bill it will be found that they were extremely limited in some cases—especially under a Conservative government which produced such a

Agricultural Stabilization Act

great degree of prosperity in the agricultural industry that it was not necessary for the government to be called upon to make good. It is only a contingency liability in this legislation; it does not have the effect of directly dealing with the revenues of the Crown.

I call upon Your Honour to rule with all your resources and advice in an attempt to put the parliamentary secretary back where he belongs.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take very long on this. In reference to motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3, I would refer Your Honour to *Hansard* for January 24, 1958, when a member of the opposition presented a motion to add another commodity. I would submit at this time that by order of the Governor in Council any commodity can be added to this bill at any time the need is found.

This is what was said at page 3790 of *Hansard* for the date I have mentioned:

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this amendment, I would like to point out that it is clearly out of order. I think there is no question that if this amendment were accepted it would add to the general cost to the treasury and it is not within the competence of any private member to make an amendment which would have that effect. I therefore think there is no question that the amendment is out of order.

That statement was made by the then minister of agriculture, Mr. Harkness. The amendment was ruled out of order.

In regard to motion No. 2, when the hon. member talks about the present clause in the legislation he says it is already covered by clause 8.2(1). This is not so in terms of expenditure. He refers to the cost of transportation and not to cost of production of input items. We use that if we are figuring the cost of any product today. When costing beef, for example, we figure out the cost of the transportation of the animal and the cost of the transportation of the grain. This is the way it is done, whether some people want to recognize it or not.

In motion No. 3 there is reference to a two-year base. When the bill was first introduced into this House in 1958, the government changed the original period from three years to ten years because it thought it was better. There is no doubt that what members opposite are suggesting now would make it more costly to the government. We have tried all the different formulas, and we think the five-year base period is the most beneficial for the producer and the consumer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): I thank hon. members for their contributions to this procedural debate; they have been enlightening, and even at times entertaining.

I think it is quite correct to point out that the guiding principle with respect to the procedural acceptability of the motions before us is in Beauchesne's fourth edition at page 207. Citation 246(3) points out that the recommendation is in reference to:

... not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) made the argument that this was only a cost, but I think the citation goes well beyond a charge alone.